#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

ELMER QUINTANILLA, Plaintiff,	§		
	§		
V.	<b>§</b>	CASE NO:	
	§		
HILLSTONE RESTAURANT	§		
GROUP, INC., Defendant.	§		
	§		
	§		

#### **PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT**

#### TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW Elmer Quintanilla ("Plaintiff" or "Quintanilla") and brings this collective action and lawsuit on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated employees to recover unpaid regular and overtime wages from Defendant Hillstone Restaurant Group, Inc. ("Defendant" or "Hillstone"); and to vindicate his rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1981. In support thereof, Plaintiff would respectfully show the Court as follows:

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff commenced employment with Defendant twenty-eight (28) years ago and has worked in the Houston's kitchen ever since. Plaintiff was classified as a nonexempt, at-will employee. Over the last five to eight years, Plaintiff worked more than 50 hours per week but was not paid overtime for all of those hours. It is believed that there are other, similarly situated employees that worked in excess of 40 hours per week and also were not paid overtime for all of those hours. Defendant knew or showed reckless disregard for whether its pay practices violated the overtime requirements of the FLSA. Additionally, Defendant discriminatorily terminated Plaintiff for his race/ethnicity, non-white.

#### II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because it arises under the laws of the United States, specifically, the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and 42 U.S.C. § 1981.
- 3. Venue is proper in this Court because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in the Southern District of Texas, and the unlawful employment practices alleged in this case occurred in the Southern District of Texas.

#### III. PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff is a resident of Harris County, Texas.
- 5. Defendant is a Foreign For-Profit Corporation doing business in the State of Texas and may be served via its registered agent, C T Corporation System, 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900, Dallas, TX 75201; or via an officer, a managing or general agent, or any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process; or wherever found.

#### IV. FACTS

- 6. Plaintiff is of Hispanic/Latino ancestry. Plaintiff commenced employment with Defendant in 1992 at Houston's on Kirby and has worked there nearly 30 years. He was a trusted kitchen employee who performed many of the duties of a kitchen manager, including receiving and checking inventory. Plaintiff was paid \$27 per hour, and always worked more than forty hours per week. Plaintiff was allowed to keep a key to the restaurant, and he would arrive in the early morning to conduct inventory. Plaintiff also conducted tasks during this time that others could not do such as cutting meat and fish. It was customary for Plaintiff to arrive one hour prior to his shift time.
- 7. During Plaintiff's tenure with Defendant, he was under the control of multiple managers that required him to clock in and out at various times. Under one kitchen manager, Plaintiff was asked to clock out at 3pm but work until 4pm. Another manager asked Plaintiff to complete tasks prior to clocking in. All of these managers were cognizant that Plaintiff worked off the clock and none seemed concerned about it.
- 8. Plaintiff worked one hour prior to clocking in every shift for the last five to eight years. He worked 30 to 60 minutes after his shift approximately two days per week. Plaintiff never took vacation time. In fact, the last time Plaintiff took time off for a vacation was five years ago. Plaintiff has been told many times that the more that the managers save on labor costs, the bigger their bonus.
- 9. In addition to continuously working off the clock, Plaintiff endured discriminatory treatment at the hands of Houston's most recent General Manager, Jeremy Zink ("Zink"). Zink is Caucasian. Zink treated the staff of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity different from those who are Caucasian. He repeatedly spoke to Plaintiff in a condescending and hostile tone. In June 2019, Zink yelled at Plaintiff in front of the staff and sent him home saying, "You don't know your job?" When Plaintiff respectfully asked that he not yell at him Zink responded, "If you don't like it go home...get out of here." Zink yelled this at Plaintiff three to four times. Plaintiff went home.
- 10. After this episode with Zink, Plaintiff called the Corporate Human Resources department and spoke to Keith [LNU]. Plaintiff told Keith of the discriminatory way that Zink treated him. He told Keith that Zink talked to him like this because of Plaintiff's ancestry, Latino, and told him that Zink assumes he has no work papers. Plaintiff told Keith of his

ancestry, that he was an American citizen, and that he deserved to be treated with respect. Keith agreed with Plaintiff that he did not deserve that treatment, and instructed him to return to work the next day. Keith said that Zink would apologize. When Plaintiff returned to work, Zink did not apologize. In fact, Zink told Plaintiff to act as if the incident never happened. After Plaintiff's complaint, Zink refused to speak to Plaintiff and did so only if he believed Plaintiff had made a mistake. Zink conveyed that all future corrections would come from Plaintiff's kitchen manager. Zink's hostile treatment of Plaintiff continued until Houston's shut down due to COVID-19.

- 11. On March 23, 2020, kitchen manager Shea (LNU) called Plaintiff to tell him not to come to work the next day; that he would get a schedule that Friday. When Plaintiff noticed he was not placed on the schedule, he inquired. Shea said he did not know happened. Three days later, Shea called to advise Plaintiff that they decided to let him go. Recognizing this might be related to the COVID-19 pandemic Plaintiff asked if he would be allowed to return once the restaurant was back to normal? Shay replied, "I don't know."
- 12. After this, Plaintiff spoke to the General Manager of the closed Westheimer location, Suzanne Clancy, who also helped with the Kirby location. He asked if he was laid off temporarily or permanently, because there were many employees working on to-go orders. Clancy told him he was "fired" and that "it wasn't an easy decision to make." When asked why, she said she "didn't need to explain all the details, I can't possibly go into all the details."
- 13. Corporate advised Plaintiff twice after being terminated not to worry, that he was not fired and would get his job back. This was a blatant lie. Plaintiff was discriminated against due to his ancestry and then terminated in retaliation for complaining of the discriminatory behavior.

#### V. CAUSES OF ACTION

# A. COUNT ONE – FAILURE TO PAY WAGES AND OVERTIME UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

- 14. Plaintiff adopts by reference all of the facts set forth above.
- 15. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, he was a nonexempt employee.
- 16. As a nonexempt employee, Defendant was legally obligated to pay Plaintiff "at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which [he was] employed [...]" for the hours worked over forty in a workweek. 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).
- 17. Defendant did not pay Plaintiff all overtime as required by 29 U.S.C. § 207 (a)(1) for the hours worked in excess of forty per week.
- 18. Defendant knew or showed a reckless disregard for whether its pay practices violated the overtime requirements of the FLSA.
  - 19. Defendant willfully violated the overtime requirements of the FLSA.

## B. COUNT TWO – COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

- 20. Plaintiff adopts by reference all of the facts set forth above.
- 21. On information and belief, other kitchen employees at the Houston's location on Kirby Drive have been victimized by Defendants' violations of the FLSA identified above. The employees are nonexempt and were not paid overtime.
- 22. These employees are similarly situated to Plaintiff because, during the relevant time period, they held similar positions, were compensated in a similar manner, and were denied overtime wages at one and one-half times their regular rate for hours worked over forty in a workweek.
- 23. Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the members of the putative class for the difference between what it actually paid them and what it was legally obligated to pay them.
- 24. Plaintiff's experiences are typical of the experiences of the putative class members; collective action treatment is appropriate.
- 25. Because Defendant knew or showed reckless disregard for whether its pay practices violated the FLSA, Defendant owe Plaintiff and members of the putative class their unpaid overtime wages.
- 26. Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the members of the putative class their unpaid overtime wages as liquidated damages.
- 27. Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the members of the putative class for their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

# C. COUNT THREE – DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1981

- 28. Plaintiff adopts by reference all of the facts set forth above.
- 29. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1981(a), "[a]ll persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right...to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other."
- 30. Plaintiff belongs to the class of people protected by Section 1981 due to his ethnicity and his status as a non-white citizen. He was fired on or around March 24, 2020, due to his ethnicity and due to his complaint about his general manager's racism and poor treatment.

- 31. Defendant had no reason for firing Plaintiff and retaining other employees, even though Plaintiff was by far the most qualified employee.
- 32. Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for exemplary and punitive damages due to its willful discrimination and retaliation against him.

#### VI. JURY DEMAND

33. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

#### VII. PRAYER

- 34. Plaintiff requests that the Court issue a summons for Defendant to appear and answer, and that Plaintiff be awarded a judgment against the Defendant for the following:
  - a. An order allowing this action to proceed as a collective action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
  - b. Judgment awarding Plaintiff and the members of the putative class all unpaid overtime compensation, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and costs;
  - c. Prejudgment interest at the applicable rate;
  - d. Incentive awards for any class representatives;
  - e. Loss compensation and benefits;
  - f. Reinstatement or front pay;
  - g. Actual, liquidated, and exemplary damages, including damages for pain and suffering;
  - h. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs;
  - i. Pre-judgment and postjudgment interest as allowed by law; and
  - j. All such other and further relief to which Plaintiff and the members of the putative class may show themselves to be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Samantha Martinez
Samantha Martinez
ATTORNEY IN CHARGE
Federal Id No. 27604
State Bar No. 24026860
Martinez Firm, PLLC
sam@mtzfirm.com
325 Heights Blvd.

Houston, TX 77007 Telephone: (713) 333-3270 Telecopier: (713) 333-3275

### Case 4:20-cv-02508 Decument 1 Filed on 07/16/20 in TXSD Page 7 of 7

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	HONS ON NEXT PAGE OF H	HIS FORM.)			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS ELMER QUINTANILLA			DEFENDANTS HILLSTONE RESTAURANT GROUP, INC.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff HARRIS  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) SAMANTHA MARTINEZ 325 HEIGHTS BLVD., HOUSTON, TX 77007 (713) 333-3270			Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	I. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		<b>IF DEF</b> 1 □ 1 Incorporated <i>or</i> Pr of Business In 1		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh.)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2		
W. MATHER OF SHIT	n		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	<b>1</b> 6 <b>1</b> 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		orts	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: Nature of BANKRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY  □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  BERSONAL PROPERTY  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage  385 Property Damage  70 385 Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIONS  Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General  535 Death Penalty  Other:  540 Mandamus & Other  550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition  560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other	422 Appeal 28 USC 158   423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   PROPERTY RIGHTS   820 Copyrights   830 Patent   835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application   840 Trademark   SOCIAL SECURITY   861 HIA (1395ff)   862 Black Lung (923)   863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))   864 SSID Title XVI   865 RSI (405(g))   FEDERAL TAX SUITS   870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)   871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
	moved from 3	Confinement  Remanded from Appellate Court	Reopened Anothe	erred from		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 42 U.S. C. 1981 ra Brief description of ca	ace/ethnicity jurisdiction	(specify) ling (Do not cite jurisdictional state)  DAMAGES FOR DISCRIE	tutes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DEMAND \$ More than \$250,000	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:  No	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 7/16/2020 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	NEY OF RECORD			
RECEIPT# AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE	